

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 18-41 remain pending. Claim 10 has been canceled. Claims 18-41 have been allowed. Claims 1, 8, 9, and 11-13 have been amended to limit the carboxylic acid component to a monocarboxylic acid component.

II. Previous Claim Rejections

Applicants acknowledge the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-14 as being anticipated by Marshall et al. (3,746,686) and of the rejection of claim 11 as being obvious over Marshall et al. (3,746,686).

III. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 12-14

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-14 as being obvious over Marshall et al. (3,746,686).

Applicants have amended claim 1 such that the carboxylic acid component of the fluxing curative is limited to a monocarboxylic acid component having 10 or more carbon atoms. Marshall et al.'s fluxing curative employs polycarboxylic acids. See Col. 4, line 10 through Col. 5, line 57:

The new curing agents ... comprise polycarboxylic acid salts Col. 4, ln 10 ff.

Accordingly, applicants submit that the claims are patentable over Marshall et al. because the reference does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as required by MPEP §§2142-2143.

Moreover, the reference provides no motivation toward applicants' fluxing curative employing a monocarboxylic acid component having 10 or more carbon atoms. Rather, the reference teaches away from the use of a monocarboxylic acid component by stating that fluxing curatives using monocarboxylic acids

"...do not have the extended latency (pot life) demanded for some applications and in most cases, these monocarboxylic acids are too hygroscopic." See Col. 2, lines 1-17.

In view of the foregoing, the Marshall et al. reference does not render claim 1 obvious, and applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-10 and 12-14 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for the same reasons as claim 1 and by virtue of the additional requirements therein.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 18-41 and the indication of the allowability of the subject matter of claim 11. Applicants submit that claim 1, from which claim 11 depends, is patentable for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the objection to claim 11 as being dependent from a rejected base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants do not believe that a fee is due in connection with this response. If, however, the Commissioner determines that a fee is due, he is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul I. J. Fleischut/

Paul. I. J. Fleischut, Reg. No. 35,513
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

PIF/NAK/clh/leb